ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ
(ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ)
ಪರಿಷ್ಕೃತ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ Accession No (B) 4778
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date

# MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

## FORTY-NINTH DAY.

*Wednesday, 30th April 1958.*

The House met in the Assembly Hall, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore, at One of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER (SRI S. R. KANTHI, B.A., LL.B.) in the Chair.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MR. SPEAKER.—Question No. 1582. The question has already been put.†

### Anti-Corruption Enquiry against the Director of Public Health.

*(Continued.)*

SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Is it a fact that certain facts are suppressed from the notice of the Government with regard to the running of a dispensary in the Public Health Office ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—Does he mean to say that this has happened while answering the question or in the course of correspondence in the Department ?

SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—How long was this fact suppressed by the Department from the Government ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—Whether it is suppression or otherwise, is a matter of opinion, but the dispensary was running from June 1952.

SRI G. SIVAPPA.—May I know whether this charge is against the office or against the Director himself ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ.—ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, was the Director of Public Health asked to wind up the dispensary attached to his office and if so, on what date ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—He was not asked to wind up. He asked for sanction and sanction was refused.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was that dispensary being run without sanction ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—That goes without saying.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How long since ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—Since 1952.

SRI Y. VEERAPPA.—What was the expenditure for running this dispensary ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—The figure is given in the answer.

SRI Y. VEERAPPA.—Have they maintained accounts regularly ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—Accounts are being maintained.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ರತ್ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾಧವರಾವ್.—ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ನಿಸ್ಪೃಹತೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸತ್ಯಶೀಲತೆ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿದೆಯೇ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—That is outside the scope of the question.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನೇಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ? ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅನಂತರ ಏಕೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಕ್ಯೂರಿ ನಡೆಸಿಲ್ಲ ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—There was no case for suspending him because the enquiry was to be completed. When *prima facie* case is known, necessary steps have been taken.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಚ್. ಬೋರೇಗೌಡ.—1952ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದ ಡಿಸ್ಪೆನ್ಸರಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. 14 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಅಂದಿನಿಂದ ಅಪಮಿನಿಯೋಗ ವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಿದೆಯೋ ?

SRI R. M. PATIL.—Since the date of its commencement. That is said to be unauthorised use of drugs.

† For previous supplementaries, please refer to pages 2363—2366 of this volume.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know sir, whether the same incumbent was the Director of Public Health in the year 1952 when the hospital was started ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—His predecessor was there, Sir.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know whether there was any reference from his predecessor in office to the Government requesting for sanction to this dispensary ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I do not know exactly, whether he had referred it or whether present incumbent referred it to the Government. It refers to some time in 1955.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—For whose benefit was the dispensary run by the Director ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—For the benefit of the officials in the Department of Public Health as well as the Superintendent, Epidemiolgy.

*Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know Sir, whether these drugs were supplied to the Public Health Department officials as a result of representations made to the Director of Public Health by them ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—These details are not with me. But these drugs were meant for Health Units.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ : –ಎಷ್ಟೆ ೈರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಅನಂತರ ಎಷ್ಟೆ ೈರಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—He said that by that time the enquiry was over. I ask, why steps were not taken to suspend the officer first and then conduct the enquiry ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Without offending my friend, I may submit that so far as the procedure in such cases is concerned, unless there is a *prima facie* case, such action could not be taken. That is why, I say, that because there appeared a *prima facie* case, action has been taken. No officer can be suspended like that.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the Government is aware that there is a *prima facie* case against that officer ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—That is why action has been taken.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—What is the action that you have taken against him now ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Necessary action has been taken. The Enquiry is going on.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, an increment was given to the said officer. Is it after the receipt of the report from the Anti-Corruption officers or prior to that, Sir ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೊದಲು ಆ ಆಫೀಸರಿಗೆ ಇಕ್ರಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಬಹುದು.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Was there any increment given to this officer ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I am not aware of it, Sir.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—Is it not a fact, Sir, that leave is forced on him till the enquiry is over ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The enquiry by the Anti-Corruption Officer is different from the enquiry which is now going on in respect of disciplinary action. My friend may know it. There are two separate enquiries. One is over and the other is on.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—May I know whether the enquiry is completed or still pending ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have not yet received the papers of enquiry. So I presume that the enquiry is still on.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಟಿ. ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಾವ್.—ಲಂಚ ನಿರೋಧ ಇಲಾಖೆ ವರದಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಹಣದ ಅಪವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದ ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಏಕೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Perhaps at that time it was not brought to the notice of the Government.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say this has been going on since 1952. Are the Accounts of the Public Health Department audited year by year? If so, whether the auditors have brought this to the notice of the Government and whether the Accountant General who also should have been informed of this, whether he took objection or not ?

*Asterisk indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—These facts are not narrated here in the proceedings that are before me.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—When the enquiry is still on, according to the Minister, are there not rules that that officer must be suspended or leave must be forced on him?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—When he asked for leave, leave was granted. Thereby the purpose of his being away from the enquiry, is served.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Yesterday the Government was pleased to say that the Report of the Anti-Corruption Officers was received in May 1957 and the enquiry against the Director of Public Health was instituted some time during the last month. May I know what was the reason for this delay of 10 months?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The delaly was due to two facts. One was as regards explanation of the officer concerned and another was, on his explanation, we had to consult the Law Department. Under such circumstances this delay has been caused.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it the opinion of the Government that this delay of 10 months would not lead to break of morale in the Department Sir?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—So far as this case is concerned, this delay has not caused any demoralisation.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—Did not the Government think that by retaining the officer, even in spite of the allegations made, relevant fact would be suppressed?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Suppressed by him, or by whom? There must be a clarification of the question.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—When the Anti-Corruption Officer conducted the enquiry, did the Director of Public Health offer any explanation?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is confidential. That cannot be revealed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—At least, does the report show that before supplying medicines to the tune of Rs. 14.000 did the Director adopt the procedure necessary?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Prescriptions were given after the examination of each of the patients who used to take medicines from this dispensary or this establishment. Accordingly medicines were used to be distributed. That is the procedure they followed. The only defect found is that there was no sanction for this. This is an irregularity.

ಶ್ರೀ ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡ.—ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಮುಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಔಷಧಗಳ ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ತಿಳಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ, ಅದನ್ನು recover ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದೆ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There is also another point and that point is, in the year 1954, all non-gazetted officers in the old Mysore area were given free medical aid. That point has also to be taken into consideration before coming to final conclusions.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಲಂಚ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಡಮೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಭಾವನೆಯೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹೇಳಿ, ಹೆಚ್ಚೋ ಕಡಮೆಯೋ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗೆ ರಜ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಆಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that free medicine was being supplied to non-gazetted officers of the State Government. May I know whether this particular dispensary was allocated the responsibility of distributing free medicines to all the N.G.O's in Bangalore City?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—On a point of order. As the departmental enquiry is going on, will it be desirable to go into all these details which would likely to prejudice the enquiry?

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all I cannot stop Hon'ble Members putting supplementaries, because a departmental enquiry is something not *sub judice*. But it would not be proper for the Hon'ble Members to go on asking questions. It is not a matter for me to give a ruling. But it is for the Hon'ble Members to have a sort of a restraint.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, I cannot understand the meaning of the word *sub judice*. How a departmental enquiry is *sub judice*, I cannot understand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have not followed what I said. I did not say that it is *sub judice*. I said it is not *sub judice*. But it appears the Hon'ble Member did not catch me.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Hon'ble Minister made a definite statement that one of the things to be taken into consideration was that medicines were suppled free to non-gazetted officers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister is on the defence.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We cannot expect anything else. I want to know whether this hospital was singled by the Government to supply free medicines to non-gazetted officers in Bangalore City.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There is no question of defence. I have stated the facts which are to be considered not only by the Government but by this Hon'ble House as well. So there is no question of defence. As regards the affording of free medical aid, the officers of this office were to get free medical aid. It is not extended to officers outside this office.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ನಡೆಯಿತು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—1952ರಿಂದ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಹೆಲ್ತ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರು ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷ ವಾಯಿತು ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have said that he took charge in 1955.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Is it not a fact that the mis-appropriation of medicines worth Rs. 14,000 has occurred during the tenure of two or three officers ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is not mis-appropriation. It is only a sort of unauthorised use in the broader sense of the word. It is using the medicines unauthorisedly. One should not confuse with the legal technical words. I have already stated to the House that registers have been maintained, and prescription papers have also been maintained. So far as Sri Venkaji Rao's question is concerned, I am not prepared to take it as misappropriation. But it has been used unauthorisedly. That is the whole point. However, there were two Directors in this whole affair: one was the predecessor of the present incumbent and the present incumbent since 1955.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Are there subordinates of the Director who are also responsible for this ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The subordinates are responsible for using the drugs. But so far as the authority is concerned, the Director of Public Health is responsible for answering. That is the whole crux of the case.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—What is the period of leave sanctioned to this officer ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—In the first instance, two months.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—If the enquiry is not complete, may I know whether the Government desires to force the officer to take further leave after the present period of leave ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is too premature. But Government expects that within two months the enquiry must be completed.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to tell us that it was an irregularity. I wish to ask the question whether it is mis-use or unauthorised way of using the drugs, is it not illegal apart from being irregular ? Is it not illegal to use the drugs without sanction or permission ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is a very interesting point. As regards dishonest intentions, if my friend agrees with me, we will have to scrutinise the case in order to understand whether there is dishonest intention. There is a circular from the Government in respect of free medical aid to the non-gazetted officers. The question of intention comes in whether the intention is dishonest or otherwise. That is a matter for legal opinion. Legal opinion has been sought.

1-30 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Was not this misuse brought to the notice of the Government from time to time when inspections were carried on ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have said that correspondence is not with me.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Was not this office inspected by auditors from time to time ; was not this misuse of the money for this purpose brought to the notice of the auditing department and the Accountant General from time to time ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I need not repeat it. I have no record to that effect.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to know whether this misuse was not brought to the notice of the Government and whether auditing was not carried on here from time to time.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—So far as auditing is concerned, I have already said that those papers were not with me. However, auditing might have been done, but the auditing so far made might not have revealed this state of affairs. Otherwise it would have been checked long back and if it were not so, the anti-corruption would not have been there. These are the facts which are to be inferred.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—When is the officer due to retire ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—How does it come within the purview of the question ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Will the Government be pleased to look into the audit reports and the observations made therein and then draw conclusions on the basis of them ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—At the time of final decision, Government shall have to take all these facts into consideration and it is premature on my part to say one thing or the other without looking into the records.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Government was pleased to say that the misuse was from the year 1952 and the present officer was posted in 1955. To what extent is the present Director responsible for this misuse ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is going into the merits of the case ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are the Government aware that in 1956 a sum of Rs. 25,000 from this department which was the due to be surrendered was not surrendered and that amount was utilised for this purpose without sanction ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It does not come within the purview of this question. This is nothing but giving information to the Government or the House.

---

Mr SPEAKER.—Question No. 1640. The Minister is not present. Sri H. K. Veeranna Gowdh has written to me saying that he will not be present here to-day and that the question may be taken up later on.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If it is a question of ill-health or going over to Delhi at the invitation of the Government of India, we can accept the explanation offered by the Minister, but not so when he is going on tour, for laying some foundation-stone or some such thing. It is not an excuse at all. The Minister should give preference to the business of the House. The business of the House is more valuable and important than laying a foundation-stone for some bridge in the State. Therefore I would request the Chair to direct that the Ministers be present when interpellations and other subjects put down in the agenda relating to them come up. A Minister cannot simply write a letter to the Speaker and take shelter under the guise of going out to attend to some function.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Here is a function sponsored by the Government. They are aware that the House is sitting and they must postpone the function to a later date when we are free.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Mr. Speaker, I have tabled a short notice question as to why the members of the Treasury Benches are being repeatedly absent from the House when important business of the House requires their constant attendance. Even after my short notice question was tabled 15 days ago, there are days when the Treasury Benches were almost empty.

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

ನಾಮಕವಾಸ್ತೆ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕುಳಿತಿರುವುದು ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ? I only wish to bring to the notice of the Chair and the House that this is a thing which should not repeat itself and that some kind of disciplinary action is indicated if such thing is possible.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇರಲಿ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಾಮಕಾವಾಸ್ತೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ವೀಕ್ಷಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By way of personal explanation. ನಾನು ಹಾಗೆ ಅನ್ನಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬರು ನಾಮಕಾವಾಸ್ತೆ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. Let him not misinterpret my speech.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನಾಮಕಾವಾಸ್ತೆ, ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಬಂದಿರುವುದು; ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 'ನಾಮಕಾವಾಸ್ತೆ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I would only like to have a clarification as to what the parliamentary procedure is in this matter. I have read in the papers that the Speaker in the Lok Sabha has several times admonished the Ministers for not being present and directed them to be present whenever important matters come up before the House. That is only a paper information and I am not sure about its authenticity. I want to know as to what should be the convention in respect of this matter.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, as far as questions are concerned, we are all aware of the Chair's direction that questions might be taken up when the concerned Ministers are present in the House. Supposing that practice is not followed and if the Chair gives a ruling to that effect, the Ministers will certainly make suitable arrangements so as to be present here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Regarding the point raised now, I would like to say that normally the Ministers should be present in the House. When the House is sitting the Ministers are expected to be present. This is a normal rule, but, there are occasions when the Ministers find it difficult to be present in the House on account of the sitting of the other House or urgent matters outside or when they have to go to Delhi for conferences, and things like that. Under such circumstances, it will not be fair to expect that they should be here in the House at all times. We have to make some exceptions and when the Minister writes that he cannot be present in the House on such and such a day, and that his business may be postponed, naturally I take that he does so *bona fide* and there is no *mala fide* intention whatsoever. At present there is another difficulty. The procedure of taking up questions is such that the Ministers are not sure as to when the questions relating to their Department will be taken up. If we state that questions relating to the portfolio of a particular minister are taken on a particular day, this difficulty would not arise. That is why we have to tolerate the absence of some ministers for the reasons I have stated.

Sri M. C. Narasimhan referred that the Speaker of the Lok Sabha has admonished the Ministers for being absent. I would only like to state that the procedure adopted in the Lok Sabha is different from ours. There, some days are allotted to different ministers and if they happen to be absent naturally they have to be taken to task. But here, on account of our own difficulties in the matter, we will have to tolerate the absence of the ministers when they so unavoidably require to be absent.

---

## Request for Acquisition of Lands for Construction of Houses to Adikarnatakas in Kattalgere Grama.

*Q.*—1813. Sri KUNDUR RUDRAPPA (Channagiri).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether they are aware of the fact that the Adikarnatakas of Kattalgere grama, Channagiri taluk, have been requesting since ten to